

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 12, 2007. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7 and 9 remain pending in the application, with Claims 2, 4, 5 and 8 having been cancelled herein. Claims 1 and 9 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 2 to 8 and 10 were objected to for informalities that have been attended to by amendment. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4 to 7, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,591,289 (Britton), Claims 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Britton in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,020,797 (Patil), and Claim 3 was rejected under § 103(a) over Britton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,002 (Sugimoto). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In the present invention, when a server receives a request from a communication terminal to perform a predetermined process (e.g., printing of image data), the server performs the requested process. Meanwhile, the server measures the performance time of the process, and also checks whether the predetermined process is complete. If the process is complete, then Web page information indicating results of the performed predetermined process is sent to the communication terminal. However, if the measured time is judged as exceeding a predetermined period of time, an e-mail describing a URL for accessing the Web page information indicating the results of the performed predetermined process is sent to the communication terminal. The foregoing features are

supported by, at least, Fig. 13 and the description from page 29, line 10 to page 32, line 7 of the original specification.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is now directed to a server apparatus which receives a request from one of a plurality of communication terminals via a network, comprising processing means for performing a predetermined process based on the request received from the one of the plurality of communication terminals, measuring means for measuring a performance time of the predetermined process, checking means for checking whether the predetermined process is complete, first sending means for sending Web page information indicating results of the performed predetermined process to the one of the plurality of communication terminals, if a result of the checking means is that the predetermined process is complete, judging means for judging whether the performance time measured by the measuring means exceeds a predetermined time period, and second sending means for sending an e-mail describing a URL for accessing the Web page information indicating results of the performed predetermined process to the one of the plurality of communication terminals, if the judging means judges that the performance time measured by the measuring means exceeds the predetermined time period.

Claim 9 is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 9, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a server apparatus performing a predetermined process based on a request received from a communication terminal, measuring a performance time of the predetermined process, checking whether the predetermined

process is complete, sending Web page information indicating results of the performed predetermined process to the communication terminal, if a result of the checking is that the predetermined process is complete, and sending an e-mail describing a URL for accessing the Web page information indicating results of the performed predetermined process to the communication terminal, if it is judged that the measured performance time exceeds a predetermined time period.

Britton is seen to disclose that a server sends an e-mail with a HTML document to a client and sends a file in FTP to a client. However, as pointed in page 5 of the Office Action, Britton does not disclose to measure an execution time of the predetermined process or to judge whether the predetermined process is complete. Further, Britton gives no hint or suggestion to control whether the server sends to the client an e-mail with a HTML document or a file in FTP in accordance with a state of the performed process. Thus, Claims 1 and 9 are not believed to be anticipated by Britton.

Patil is merely seen to disclose to measure an execution time of job by a timer, and if the execution time exceeds a maximum limiting time, to causes the job to be killed and informs a user of a rescheduling of the job. However, Patil gives no hint or suggestion to use the measured time to control whether the result of performing a predetermined process is informed to a user via Web page information or e-mail describing a URL for accessing the Web information. Thus, Patil fails to make up for the deficiencies of Britton and Claims 1 and 9 are believed to be allowable over the proposed combination.

Sugimoto is not seen to make up for the deficiencies of Britton and Patil. In this regard, Sugimoto is merely seen to disclose to measure a volume of data, and if the measured volume of data exceeds a predetermined threshold value, to inform a user of a

warning indicating a buffer overflow, but gives no hint or suggestion to use the measured volume of data to control whether the results of performing a predetermined process is informed to a user via Web page information or e-mail describing a URL for accessing the Web information. Therefore, the proposed combination of Britton, Patil and Sugimoto would not have resulted in the present invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Claims 1 and 9, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200